

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6-16, 18-24, 26-28 and 30-34 are presently pending in this application. Claims 19, 27, 28, 31 and 33 have been amended in this response.

In the Office Action mailed November 29, 2002, claims 2-4, 6-16, 18-24, 26-28 and 30-34 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

(A) Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph;

(B) Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,400,213 to Honda et al. ("Honda") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,049,863 to Oka ("Oka") and U.S. Patent No. 5,510,953 to Merkel ("Merkel");

(C) Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka, Merkel, and U.S. Patent No. 5,903,259 to Brusky et al. ("Brusky");

(D) Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka, Merkel, and U.S. Patent No. 6,205,021 to Klein et al. ("Klein");

(E) Claims 26, 28 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka;

(F) Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka and Brusky; and

(G) Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka and Klein.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on February 11, 2003. During that telephone conference, the present Office Action and the pending claims were discussed. The following remarks summarize and expand upon the points discussed in the February 11th telephone conference.

A. Response to the Section 112 Rejection

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 28 has been amended to clarify the antecedent basis. Accordingly, the Section 112 rejection of this claim should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, 16 and 18-21

Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, 16 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka and Merkel.

1. Claim 18 is Directed to a Portable Computer Having a Base and a Removable Wireless Keyboard With a Power Supply Independent of the Base That Includes an External Alternating Current Power Adapter

Aspects of the invention are directed toward a portable personal computer that includes a base and a removable wireless keyboard that can be mounted within the base. The keyboard has a power supply independent of the base that includes an external alternating current power adapter. An advantage of this arrangement is the ability to use the keyboard remotely without interruption to charge the battery.

In particular, claim 18 is directed to a portable personal computer including a base having a recess and a controller, a display attached to the base, and a removable wireless keyboard for communicating with the controller in the base. The wireless keyboard communicates with the controller through a signal interface when the keyboard is mounted into the base and through a wireless connection when the keyboard is removed from the base. The keyboard has an upper surface, a lower surface, and at least one side surface. When the keyboard is mounted in the base, the lower surface and/or the at least one side surface is received in the recess. The removable wireless keyboard also has a power supply independent of the base that includes an external alternating current power adapter. Accordingly, a computer having the features recited in claim 18 can achieve the benefits described above.

2. Claim 30 is Directed to an Input Device for a Portable Computer Including a Removable Wireless Keyboard Having a Power Supply Independent of the Computer That Includes an External Alternating Current Power Adapter Source

Claim 30 is directed to an input device for a portable personal computer. The input device includes a removable wireless keyboard capable of being mounted within a base of the portable computer. The removable wireless keyboard communicates with the portable computer through a hardwired interlocking connection when the keyboard is mounted within the base and through a wireless connection when the keyboard is removed from the base. The removable wireless keyboard has a power supply independent of the computer that includes an external alternating current power adapter source. Accordingly, an input device having the features recited in claim 30 can achieve the benefits described above.

3. Honda Discloses a Computer Having a Case and a Keyboard Electrically Coupled to the Case by a Curled Cord

Honda discloses a computer having a case and a removable keyboard. The front portion of the upper surface of the case has a stepped portion on which the keyboard can be placed. The removable keyboard is electrically connected to the case by a curled cord.

4. Oka Discloses a Computer Having a Keyboard and a Key Input Unit Removable From the Keyboard

Oka discloses a computer having a keyboard and a key input unit removable from the keyboard. The key input unit can be a mouse. The key input unit includes a power source (e.g., a button-type battery) which is switched on by a switch mechanism when the key input device is removed from the keyboard.

5. Merkel Discloses a Concealed Locking Assembly for a Removable Portable Computer Keyboard

Merkel discloses a portable computer having a removable keyboard assembly and a base housing. The removable keyboard assembly includes a base pan and a rectangular monoblock support structure receivable within the base pan. The removable keyboard assembly is received in an opening in the base housing.

6. The Office Action Fails to Establish a *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness for Claim 18

The MPEP requires the Examiner to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness. If the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of non-obviousness. A *prima facie* case requires the Examiner to provide, *inter alia*, prior art references that disclose all of the elements of the claim and a basis for combining or modifying the references. MPEP § 2143.01 provides, "[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." For the reasons discussed below, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 18.

For example, assuming for the sake of argument that the removable keyboard of Honda and the battery in the key input device of Oka correspond at least in part to the removable wireless keyboard and the power supply, respectively, recited in claim 18, the applied references fail to disclose, *inter alia*, "a removable wireless keyboard" that "has a power supply independent of said base, and wherein said power supply includes an external alternating current power adapter," as recited by claim 18. Consequently, the applied references fail to disclose each and every feature of claim 18.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion to modify the applied references to include "a removable wireless keyboard" having "a power supply independent of said base" that "includes an external alternating current power adapter," as recited in claim 18. In fact, Oka teaches away from the features of claim 18. Oka states, "since the key input unit eliminates the need to use a cable or a cord, it is easier to use than the conventional mouse." (Oka at column 5, lines 27-29.) Thus, Oka teaches away from adding an alternating current power adapter and the associated cable or cord to the key input unit. Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to add an AC adapter and an associated power cord to a mouse because the purpose of a mouse is to provide a device with mobility to facilitate the ease with which a user inputs data. Connecting a power cord to a mouse, while providing many benefits, could reduce the ease with which a user could move the mouse. Therefore, the Office Action fails to

establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under Section 103 because a) the applied references fail to disclose all the features of claim 18 and b) there is no motivation to modify the devices disclosed in the references to include the features of claim 18. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15, 16 and 19-21 depend from claim 18. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18 and for the additional features of these claims.

C. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 14

Claim 14 depends from claim 18 and accordingly includes, *inter alia*, the features of claim 18. Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka, Merkel, and Brusky. Brusky fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Honda, Oka, and Merkel to properly support a Section 103(a) rejection of claim 18 (as discussed above) and, because claim 14 includes the features of claim 18, claim 14 as well. For example, the combination of Honda, Oka, Merkel, and Brusky fails to disclose or suggest "a removable wireless keyboard" having "a power supply independent of said base" that "includes an external alternating current power adapter," as recited in claim 14. Brusky merely discloses a computer system having a wireless keyboard that can remotely control a standard computer and another device. Furthermore, Brusky fails to cure the above-noted lack of motivation to modify Oka's key input device. Thus, the applied references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 14. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claims 22-24

Claims 22-24 depend from claim 18 and accordingly include, *inter alia*, the features of claim 18. Claims 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka, Merkel, and Klein. Klein fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Honda, Oka, and Merkel to properly support a Section 103(a) rejection of claim 18 (as discussed above) and, because claims 22-24 include the features of claim 18, claims 22-24 as well. For example, the combination of Honda, Oka, Merkel, and Klein fails to disclose or suggest "a removable wireless keyboard" having "a power

supply independent of said base" that "includes an external alternating current power adapter," as recited in claims 22-24. Accordingly, the applied references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claims 22-24 for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18 and for the additional features of these claims. Therefore, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 22-24 should be withdrawn.

E. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claims 26, 28 and 30-33

Claims 26, 28 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka. Independent claim 30 includes, *inter alia*, features generally similar to those described above with reference to claim 18. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of this claim should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 18 and for the additional features of claim 30.

Claims 26, 28 and 31-33 depend from claim 30. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 30 and for the additional features of these claims.

F. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 27

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka and Brusky. Claim 27 depends from claim 30. As discussed above with reference to claim 14, Brusky fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Honda and Oka. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 27 should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claims 14 and 30 and for the additional features of claim 27.

G. Response to the Section 103(a) Rejection of Claim 34

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda in view of Oka and Klein. Claim 34 depends from claim 30. As discussed above with reference to claims 22-24, Klein fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Honda and Oka. Accordingly, the Section 103(a) rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn for the reasons discussed above with reference to claims 22-24 and 30 and for the additional features of claim 34.

H. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant, therefore, requests reconsideration of the application and an allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the above-noted distinctions between the claims and the cited references, or any other distinctions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact David Dutcher by telephone. Additionally, if the Examiner notices any informalities in the claims, he is also encouraged to contact David Dutcher to expediently correct any such informalities.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP



David T. Dutcher

Registration No. 51,638

DTD:ri

Enclosures:

Postcard

Check

PTO-1083 (+ copy)

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 583-8888

FAX: (206) 583-8500

APPENDIX

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

In the Claims:

19. (Twice Amended) The portable personal computer of claim 18, wherein said power supply further includes at least one battery.

27. (Twice Amended)___The input device of claim 30, wherein said removable wireless ~~input device~~keyboard has an upper surface and a lower surface, and at least first, second, and third sides perpendicular to said upper and lower surfaces, and at least first and second infrared devices for at least transmitting infrared signals, said first and second infrared devices located on at least two of said first, second, and third sides of said removable wireless ~~input device~~keyboard.

28. (Twice Amended) The input device of claim 30, wherein said removable wireless ~~input device~~keyboard has a first mating connector and said base has a second mating connector, wherein said first mating connector and said second mating connector provide a hardwired connection when said removable wireless ~~input device~~keyboard is mounted into said base.

31. (Twice Amended) The input device of claim 30, wherein said power supply further includes at least one battery.

33. (Twice Amended) The input device of claim 30, further comprising at least one retaining device for securing said removable wireless ~~input device~~keyboard to said computer.